

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the examiner's time in the telephone conference of December 15, 2003. The following comments confirm the Applicant's position regarding the obviousness rejection of the pending claims. As claim 14 is seen as the key independent claim, the remarks will be directed only to claim 14. However, independent claims 41 and 42 each include the deliberate distortion of at least one of a stereoscopic pair of images as in claim 14. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth below relative to claim 14, claims 41 and 42 are also patentable over the references of record.

Claim 14 has a "means for improving the stereoscopic match between the two images as viewed, by distorting at least one of the images". Neither Craig nor Surati discloses any such means. In order for references to make a claim obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, the combination of the references must disclose each element of the claim. The combination of Craig and Surati does not disclose this element of claim 14. Accordingly, the claim must be patentable.

Craig makes no mention of improving the stereoscopic match between two images, and also does not mention distorting at least one image to improve the stereoscopic match between two images. Indeed, Craig does not distort the images for any purpose.

Surati creates a single image from a number of separate projections, each comprising only a portion of the entire image, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. Surati distorts these separate images in order to correct for their misalignment. The end result is that the several projections are properly aligned so that, together they create a high-quality single

image. Surati thus does not have ANY means for improving a stereoscopic match between two images.

Accordingly, the references as combined by the examiner simply do not disclose this element of claim 14. And, in order to make any claim obvious, the references as a whole must disclose every element of that claim. As neither reference discloses this means of claim 14, combining Surati's image distortion with Craig does not disclose such means. The claim must therefore be patentable.

Further, the combination of these references is improper under the law. At most, combining the image distortion of Surati w/ Craig would seamlessly align the two images of Craig, which would not improve the stereoscopic match. Craig shows in the figures that a seam is required between the top and bottom images. In fact, then, seamless alignment of the two Craig images using the Surati technique would actually make the stereoscopic match of Craig worse, because the two Craig images would be more perfectly aligned, and the display would lose the sharp top edge of the bottom image and the sharp bottom edge of the top image. As the combination would negatively affect the result of one reference (Craig), under the law of 35 U.S.C. 103, the combination is improper.

The Applicant herein teaches that image distortion to improve the stereoscopic match between two stereoscopic images improves the quality of an immersive display. Surati has nothing to do w/ stereoscopic viewing of a pair of images, so could not even use any means for improving the stereoscopic match between two images. Thus, one skilled in the art having knowledge of Surati would not even consider improving the match between stereoscopic images, and so would never look to Craig for any purpose.

Thus, the clear teachings of the references themselves teaches away from any combination, making their combination clearly improper under the law of 35 U.S.C. section 103.

Allowance is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned in Westborough, Massachusetts, (508) 898-1501.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian M. Dingman, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,729